

\$6.50 per month) and the Government would pay two-thirds of the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury. It was the same program provided by the Government today for Members of Congress and Federal employees.

It was agreed by some that if we could give aid to the nations all over the world, if we could pay benefits to labor, industry, and agriculture, if we could assist Federal employees, then we could subsidize the medical needs of the aged to meet their medical costs. The question has also been raised why should a worker with two dependents and earning \$3,600 per year be required to pay an income tax of \$214 and also hospitalization costs for a person on retirement who has an income of \$3,600, pays no income tax and contributes nothing toward the hospital care program.

I supported the Byrnes proposal. I could not in good conscience support the administration proposal which in my opinion undermines the whole social security structure and places unnecessary additional burden on those who now pay social security.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOSPITAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY?

Most of us have always considered social security as a program under which we would receive a pension at age 65—which combined with our life savings—would make it possible for us to maintain a decent standard of living during our years of retirement. When the program was first enacted in 1937, it held out much promise. But since then what has happened to social security?

Through the years we have so expanded and enlarged upon the original intent that, like Government bonds, it is rapidly losing its attractiveness. We now have on the books commitments to pay out approximately \$625 billion to those on retirement or covered by social security. We have in assets around \$305 billion. If all payments into the fund were to stop—we would be \$300 billion short to meet present commitments.

Instead of building up reserves, as private pension programs do, we have actually been paying out approximately as much as we have been taking in. We have continued not only to increase the social security rate but also the earnings base upon which the tax is paid. In 1954, when disability payments were added, we were told OASI trust funds would climb to \$28.5 billion by 1965—actually the fund is now estimated at around \$19 billion—\$7.5 billion short. And now we are enlarging the program by adding hospital care, increasing cash benefits and reducing the age requirements for widows.

Have pension payments kept pace with the increased social security payments made by the worker? The answer is "No." In 1939, an employee who earned \$550 per month paid \$30 per year into the social security fund. He could look forward to receiving \$58 per month on retirement. Today an employee earning the same amount pays \$174 into the social security fund and his maximum social security benefit is \$127 per month. By 1973, an employee earning \$550 per month will pay \$353 annually into the social security fund, and he will receive a maximum pension check of \$168. In other words while the cost has gone up 480 percent—the workers retirement check has increased only 119 percent.

What is there about social security that is attractive to the young man who is about to enter the labor force for the first time? One must remember that these are the workers upon whom we must depend to pay into the fund so that those over 65 may secure these benefits. A young man, 21 years of age, entering the labor force next year and paying the full amount of social security until 65, could have deposited the same amount in a building and loan at 4½ percent, and he would accumulate by retirement time an estimate of \$42,000. If we add the employer's share, it would be \$84,000. His retirement checks under social security would

total \$2,004 per annum. If he invested \$42,000 at 5 percent, he would earn \$2,100 annually and still leave an estate of \$42,000 at his death.

Can we keep expanding the social security program by adding hospital care, medical care, increasing benefits to those over 65, and charge it to social security? Yes, if those who pay into the fund are willing to stand for an increase in the payroll tax and the earning base upon which the tax is paid. It should be remembered, however, that the social security tax by 1971 will be as burdensome as the income tax. For example, take a man earning \$5,000 per year with a wife and two dependents—in 1971 his income tax will be approximately \$290 and his social security tax will be \$260. These, of course, will be increased when demands are made that Congress grant further increases in social security benefits to meet living costs, and as hospital and medical services increase in cost.

A hospital care program for those over 65 financed by a payroll tax attached to social security not only does serious damage to the social security pension program but it also inflicts the most unfair tax in our whole taxing system. The president of the corporation pays on the same basis as the plant janitor.

In closing may I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe in providing hospital care and medical care for those who are in need. I want to help those who can care for themselves, but live in constant dread that one serious illness will place them on relief. But I want to do it without wrecking the social security pension system for those who are between the ages of 21 and 65 and are required to foot the bill. I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. That is why I favored the financing provided by the Byrnes alternative and opposed the administration bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
April 19, 1965.

I hereby designate the Honorable HALE BOGGS to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., prefaced his prayer with Acts 11: 24: *He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.*

Most merciful and gracious God, who art always guiding and guarding us in the difficult ways of life, may we commit ourselves gladly and faithfully to the wise and beneficent dispensation of Thy divine providence.

Inspire us with a triumphant faith in our search and struggle for the welfare of all mankind and may we be fearless

and undisturbed in the midst of life's frustrations and confusions because of Thy sustaining grace and our trust in Thee.

May we always seek to coordinate our freedom with restraint and self-discipline and may we be unswervingly loyal to the highest ideals of democracy and the leading of Thy Holy Spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1965, was read and approved.

BIG DAYS ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, the New York Post published an editorial entitled "Big Days on Capitol Hill." The editorial said some very complimentary things about the work of this Congress. I think that there is a great deal of merit to these comments and I am inserting them in the RECORD so that

these views will gain an audience all over the country:

BIG DAYS ON CAPITOL HILL

1. VICTORY FOR MEDICARE

Overwhelming House approval of the Medicare bill is, in President Johnson's words, "a landmark day in the historic evolution of our social security system." It is also a tribute to the President's skillful legislative hand.

Passage of the measure by so decisive a margin virtually insures its enactment; no serious obstacles are anticipated in the Senate, where such legislation was approved in 1964.

Thus, a long, memorable battle, begun under Harry Truman and pressed by John F. Kennedy, draws to a triumphant close. Despite the propaganda war cries of the American Medical Association, the measure embodies no revolutionary change in our social structure; private medical business will go on as usual. But citizens over 65 will have the chance to obtain reasonable protection and treatment too often denied.

"The people do not understand this bill," lamented Dr. Dunovan F. Ward, president of the AMA, when he heard the news of the House action.

He is wrong. The people finally rejected the political quackery so long practiced by the AMA lobby. The issue was fought out clearly in the presidential campaign, and it was basically resolved in the Johnson landslide. How many more dollars will the AMA invest in its dreary lost cause?

2. NEW ADVANCES ON VOTING RIGHTS

There is growing prospect that the voting rights bill so eloquently advocated by President Johnson in his memorable "we

shall overcome" address will return to him in even stronger form than originally urged by the administration. In the Senate Judiciary Committee a coalition of six liberal Democrats and three Republicans has succeeded in pushing through five amendments to broaden the scope of the measure; the major ones would bar the poll tax and extend automatic coverage to counties where court determination was initially required. In the House Judiciary Committee, headed by Representative CELLER, similar steps have been taken to close all loopholes in the original draft.

These committee moves are subject to future challenge; but they clearly reflect a decisive turning of the tide. The ancient GOP-Dixiecrat coalition is divided and retreating on Capitol Hill; the civil rights legions are on the offensive, and the scope of their victory may exceed all original expectations.

3. TOWARD AN EDUCATION BILL

In the resurgence of progressivism on Capitol Hill, the long stalemate over aid-to-education legislation is finally over. We regret that our cheers for this development must be accompanied by some reservations.

We previously voiced our hope that the bill would embody a provision explicitly authorizing taxpayer suits to contest the constitutionality of aid for religious schools. Such an amendment was rejected by the Senate Friday.

While our concern on this point remains, it must also be acknowledged that many lawyers—including Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon—argue that the disputed issue can still be tested by State actions. They also contend that inclusion of the amendment could, as Senator MORSE put it, "tie up this bill in litigation for 5 to 7 years and delay indefinitely the aid for 5 million children so badly needed."

This is a close argument of both substance and strategy on which men of good will can reasonably differ. Our preference for the amendment stands. But we do not regard its defeat as calamitous in the larger context of a breakthrough toward a meaningful Federal aid program.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE MARTYRDOM OF JEWS IN WARSAW GHETTO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the date April 19 is a solemn reminder of the cruelest and most diabolical atrocities ever committed against mankind. Throughout the world people can never forget, nor should they forget, the bestial acts of the Nazis against the innocent men, women, and children in Warsaw. These human beings, who loved, obeyed, and feared God were the victims of the savage and ruthless lust for blood and torture of Hitler's minions only because they were Jews. Because they were Jews they were subjected to the basest and most painful forms of torture and death ever recorded in history.

Last week my friend, Cantor Moshe Koussevitsky, stood before an overflow crowd of silent and emotionally moved men and women, some of them weeping survivors of the concentration camps, to sing again the *El Mole Rachamim* as he had done in Warsaw 20 years ago.

It was my privilege several years ago to visit the Ghetto Monument in Warsaw and to pause in silent tribute to the memory of the hundreds of thousands of martyred Jews who met death at the hands of the Nazis. It was 20 years ago on that spot Cantor Moshe Koussevitsky chanted the Hebrew prayer for the dead, the more than 6 million Jews who were slain by the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that my visit in Warsaw made a lasting impression upon me and I shall never think of Warsaw without recalling the horrors inflicted upon so many of its citizens. But even without such a visit to the ghetto memorial, we as Americans can ill afford to forget that black and evil page of history. We must remind ourselves again and again that such tragedies can and will recur unless we maintain constant vigilance and be ever watchful to see that no tyrant, no despot and no segment of people can assume power sufficient to mow down millions of people whose only crime is to be born of a certain race or of a certain color or who may follow certain religious concepts.

Mr. Speaker, as we remind ourselves of this 20th year of the opening of the death camps and the liberation of thousands of suffering prisoners, as we share our sympathy with those who lost loved ones in those camps, may we firmly resolve that we will rededicate ourselves to the resolute purpose of assuring that never again will man be permitted to mistreat his fellow man in the awful manner which is recalled by this anniversary.

Under the permission granted me by the House, I should like to include the following news article written by Irving Spiegel, for the New York Times of Monday, April 12, 1965:

MEMORIAL HERE RECALLS WARSAW PRAYER FOR JEWS

(By Irving Spiegel)

Twenty years ago this month, Cantor Moshe Koussevitsky stood in the rubble of the Warsaw ghetto and chanted the Hebrew prayer for the dead, the "*El Mole Rachamim*" (God, full of mercy) in memory for 6 million Jews who died during the Hitler regime.

Yesterday, Cantor Koussevitsky, standing before an overflow crowd of 2,500 persons, their heads bowed, in the grand ballroom of the American Hotel, again sang the "*El Mole Rachamim*." Many who were survivors of the death camps wept.

The ceremony had a twofold purpose: a memorial meeting and the 20th observance of the liberation of the concentration camps by the Allied armies. It was sponsored by the Council of Organizations of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York.

A film of the scene of 20 years ago when Cantor Koussevitsky intoned the prayer in the charred ruins of the battle of the Warsaw ghetto showed the emaciated faces of the newly liberated survivors.

CANDLES AS SYMBOLS

The 10-minute film was called "Prayer for the Dead on the Ruins of the Warsaw Ghetto."

After the showing, six concentration camp survivors lighted six candles on a black-covered candelabra, each candle symbolizing 1 million Jewish men, women, and children who had died. As the six stood by the candelabra, wiping tears away, Cantor Koussevitsky, accompanied by a choir,

chanted the "*El Mole Rachamim*" in sotto voice.

The survivors were Mrs. Frances Garfinkel, of the Auschwitz camp; Mrs. Jacob Brass, of Buchenwald; Mrs. Eva Romanowitz, of Bergen Belsen; Isaac Pulvermacher, of Dachau; Mrs. Pola Tycon, of Mathausen, and Joseph Wasser, of Treblinka.

Overhead on the platform, which was draped in black, were three lines, also in black, that stood out in bold relief. The first, in Hebrew, was a verse from Isaiah the prophet: "And I shall give unto you in mine house and mine walls a monument and a name." The second, in Yiddish, read: "Remember forever the 6 million martyrs." The third, in English, said: "We will never forget."

Cantor Koussevitsky is now associated with Temple Beth El in Brooklyn. Twenty years ago he returned to Warsaw from the Soviet Union, to which he had fled to escape the Nazis. He came to this country shortly after the end of the war.

In a message to the group President Johnson wrote, in part: "The memory of those who died in this century as victims of prejudice and oppression must be honored by us all through unceasing vigilance against bigotry and bias in our society and unrelenting efforts to assure a world of peace, freedom, and justice for all peoples without regard to creed, color, or continent of their birth."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. MOSS), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MOSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLATNIK.

THE LATE HONORABLE OLIN D. JOHNSTON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 344

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following members on the part of the

House: Mr. McMillan, Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Dorn, Mr. Ashmore, and Mr. Gettys.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

950. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the fiscal year 1966 budget request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 147); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

951. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certification of an adequate soil survey and land classification of lands in the silt project, Colorado, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

952. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1964, pursuant to 75 Stat. 443; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank, for the month of March 1965, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

954. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred through the duplication of shipping services to the Panama Canal Zone by the Military Sea Transportation Service and the Panama Canal Company, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

955. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of failure to effectively utilize excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay international air travel ticket costs being paid in dollars, Department of State, Department of Defense, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, and other Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

956. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of inconsistent practices in the administration of the Government schools program in London, England, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

957. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting drafts of two bills to amend the Federal Power Act with regard to the construction and operation of electric transmission lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

958. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinions and findings *In re North Counties*

Hydro-Electric Company, a Corporation of Illinois v. The United States, Congressional No. 2-59, pursuant to House Resolution 189 of the 86th Congress, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 701. An act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 7549. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7550. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1914, commonly known as the Clayton Act, to make it applicable to certain sales of commodities made to governmental agencies for resale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7551. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7552. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 7553. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 345. Resolution relating to the operation of the House of Representatives restaurants; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

204. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to opposing the executive reorganization plan relating to the Bureau of Customs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to prompt approval of legislation relating to voting rights of all citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the voting rights bill of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7554. A bill for the relief of Marianna Galati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7555. A bill for the relief of Filippa Fucarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 7556. A bill for the relief of Irene Kalamaridou (also known as Irini Kalamarides); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

172. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to expressing opposition to the rice price increase as proposed in the omnibus farm bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

173. Also, petition of Lawton Area AFL-CIO Labor Council, Lawton, Okla., relative to enacting legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

174. Also, petition of Nassau County Mental Health Board, Mineola, N.Y., relative to enactment of H.R. 2985 and/or S. 513, authorizing Federal assistance to communities for initial staffing operations of the community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TYDINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 23 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, until Wednesday, April 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Future of the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have included in the RECORD the graphic statement of the mounting demand for stronger action to combat water pollution of the Great Lakes. As the author of one of the most important amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, is fast distinguishing himself as a real fighter for clean water. The 39th District of New York can be justly proud of the bright, industrious leader that they have sent to Congress. I hope that he will long serve them and us.

The statement follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE GREAT LAKES

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, U.S. Representative, 39th District, New York, at junior chamber of commerce banquet, Cordon Bleu Restaurant, Buffalo, N.Y.)

Tonight, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on a problem that I regard as the most urgent of our times.

The problem to which I refer, in a word is, water.

Water is the lifeblood of this Niagara frontier. Without Lake Erie, there would be no Buffalo—there would be no Erie County—as we know it. Without Lake Erie many of us would not even exist today. For without it, our forebears would not have had an economic reason to come here, marry, and settle down. In my own case, this is so. It was in 1822 that my great, great grandfather came here to work on the Erie Canal. Since then, all six generations of my family have, at various times, in one way or another, earned their livelihoods from activities connected with the lake.

Water is vital to our commerce * * * to our manufacturing plants * * * to our recreation. Most important, water is vital to sustaining life. Water truly is Buffalo's most precious resource. Lake Erie is like a great goddess, brooding over the vast metropolis she spawned. Brooding indeed, for we have been extremely careless with this precious resource.

Lake Erie is so terribly polluted that it is in danger of becoming worthless for many purposes. And Lake Erie problems are compounded by the fact that the level of the lake is at the lowest point in many years.

Pollution of fresh water supplies is not a problem that is peculiar to Buffalo—or to Lake Erie. This is a national problem.

As the late Rachel Carson observed in her well-known book, "Silent Spring."

In an age when man has forgotten his origins and has neglected even his most essential needs for survival, "water along with other resources has become the victim of his indifference."

Our Nation uses about 300 billion gallons of water per day—out of a total manageable supply of 1,200 billion gallons a day. And our consumption is rising fantastically. It is estimated that by 1980 the United States will be consuming 600 billion gallons of water per day—twice as much as we are using now.

We no longer can afford to be indifferent about our water.

The problem in Lake Erie isn't something that is going to reach a critical stage 10, 15, or 20 years in the future. The problem is critical now. We should have acted before this.

Already, some experts are wondering whether it is too late to save Lake Erie.

I am not that pessimistic. I certainly am not about to throw up my hands in despair. But I do believe that we need to pledge all our skills, all our imagination, to seeking solutions to this perplexing problem.

During my campaign for election last fall, I talked a lot about pollution. During the 3½ months I have been a Member of Congress, I have been trying very hard to do something about it.

I have sponsored legislation in the House of Representatives that is designed to strengthen the role of the Federal Government—and enhance the Federal-State-local partnership—in fighting water pollution in western New York and elsewhere.

My communications with the people of Erie County show that 70 percent of the citizens in the 39th Congressional District agree with me that a strong Federal program is needed.

Yet, the deeper I get into water, the more I question whether even a strong Federal program, intermeshed with State and local programs, will in the long run be adequate to solve all the problems of Lake Erie.

Let's take a quick look at some vital geographical factors.

Lake Erie touches the borders of four States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. A huge portion of Lake Erie's shoreline lies in the Province of Ontario.

Lake Erie is not just the concern of the United States. The fortunes of this body of water are of immense importance to both the United States and Canada.

The fortunes of Lake Erie also are closely tied to the other Great Lakes—Ontario, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. And these other lakes, in turn, affect the well-being of millions of people in other States and other Provinces.

Therefore, it seems to me that when we reflect on the problems of Lake Erie, we must do so in the context of the entire Great Lakes Basin.

Within this huge basin reside 27 million people. Touching these lakes are 15 cities with populations in excess of 100,000.

Pollution is a serious matter in the Great Lakes, but it is not the only problem. Another problem that probably is just as serious is the level of the lakes.

As I reminded you earlier, Lake Erie is at its lowest level in many years. This is a problem that is shared by the other Great Lakes.

Man can be blamed for pollution—but he is not responsible, at least not in a significant way, for rising and falling lake levels. Nature causes this fluctuation, but man must somehow learn to live with it—or perhaps try to do something about it.

Many people—myself included—are disturbed by the present low level of Lake Erie. It dropped almost 5 feet from 1952 to 1964.

This is a serious matter—but it is less shocking when viewed from a long-range perspective.

Lake Erie was lower in 1936 than it is today. When you look at records for the past 100 years, you discover up-and-down trends in rainfall in the Great Lakes Basin—and that the level of the lakes generally follows the precipitation patterns.

Present problems don't stem from the fact that anything unusual is happening to lake levels. Rather, our difficulties stem from our increasing dependence on the lakes.

As more and more people depend on the lake for more and more pursuits, it becomes increasingly necessary that we receive a so-called normal amount of rainfall to keep the lakes at a so-called normal level.

Nature, unfortunately, doesn't operate that way. Wild fluctuations from the "normal" are in themselves normal.

One hundred years ago a sharp drop in the lake levels was inconvenient. Today the same occurrence could prove disastrous.

The problems of pollution and low lake levels are not separate and distinct. They very definitely are linked.

It is obvious, I think, that when the amount of water in a lake decreases, pollution problems are increased.

There are some who think that the ultimate answer to pollution in Lake Erie lies in seeking means to develop faster turnover of the water in the lake.

Preventing pollutants, in the form of municipal and industrial wastes, from entering the lake is an obvious necessity. And the legislation I have sponsored in the House of Representatives is designed to check the flow of wastes into Lake Erie. In time, with local and State cooperation, this can be done.

But—even if this program is completely successful—there are serious doubts that it will succeed in actually abating pollution in Lake Erie. Scientists say that stopping wastes from entering the lake will only prevent the Lake Erie problem from becoming much worse.

There are various possibilities for actually abating pollution—none of them simple or cheap.

Scientists have discovered that the oxygen supply has been depleted in a vast portion of Lake Erie by algae—which apparently are prospering because pollutants, in the form of nitrogen and phosphorus, have given them an abundant food supply. So, one step in controlling pollution would be to dredge the algae from the lake and bury it in adjacent ground. Another would be to recharge the lake's water supply.

More water for the Great Lakes would abate pollutants by flushing them out. The infusion of more water, on a controlled basis, would make it possible to stabilize and regulate lake levels and more water would provide for the increasing needs of the growing United States and Canadian populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

How could such a solution be brought about? Where would we get the water to permit faster turnover in Lake Erie? The only source for the vast quantity of water that would be needed to implement such a scheme is our northern neighbor, Canada.

The ultimate solution lies in diverting water into the Great Lakes from rivers that flow into Hudson's Bay.

The political and economic problems of such a grand scheme are enormous. The technical difficulties that would be encountered stagger the imagination.

The costs, obviously, will run into many, many millions of dollars. And they should be shared by the United States and Canada in proportion to the benefits each would receive. It is obvious that both nations would realize enormous benefits from such a vast project. But only Canada has the water that both countries need.

The problems would be gigantic—but the benefits very probably would be equally gigantic.

We must recognize that we face some very serious handicaps in making sweeping, long-range plans for the Great Lakes.

Basically, these handicaps fall into two categories. On the one hand, we have a multitude of legitimate and reasonable vested interests, both public and private, in

the lakes. On the other hand, we have a multitude of agencies that in one way or another are involved in the management of the lakes.

A good many entities—the State of New York, for instance, have both a vested interest and a hand in management.

Sadly lacking is any agency with the authority and the capability to look at the problems of the Great Lakes from an overall perspective and chart overall goals and the means of attaining them.

The need for such an agency is clearly indicated when we consider the deep interdependence of the water users on the lakes. The Chicago area, for instance, depends on Lake Michigan in various ways and would like to divert more water from the lake. Chicago's needs cannot be argued, but if Chicago diverts more water, this will affect the level of Lake Erie at Cleveland, aggravate the pollution problem at Detroit, and reduce power-generating capacity at Niagara Falls. Lower levels in harbors mean that shipping firms cannot load their boats to full capacity—thus increasing shipping costs per ton.

The principal coordinating agency for the lakes is the International Joint Commission, which was created by a treaty between the United States and Canada in 1909. The International Joint Commission's sphere of interest extends all across the long boundary between our Nation and Canada.

I definitely am not critical of the International Joint Commission. This is a distinguished body with many accomplishments to its credit.

The difficulty with the International Joint Commission, as presently organized, is that it lacks effective teeth. The International Joint Commission is an instrument of the United States and Canadian Governments and is empowered to inquire into and coordinate matters referred it by the two Governments.

We might expand the powers of the International Joint Commission or some other agency or agencies. Or we might create a new body. And this is what I propose: A new international agency whose sole concern is the Great Lakes.

One model we might consider using for guidance in establishing a planning and development body for the Great Lakes is the Arctic Institute—a creation of the United States and Canada that has been notably successful.

Setting up a similar institute for the Great Lakes was one of the possibilities suggested by Michel Chevalier in a distinguished treatise he wrote. Mr. Chevalier, who is from Montreal, wrote the paper in connection with research he has been conducting at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Arctic Institute was incorporated in 1945 in both the United States and Canada. Legally, it is two separate bodies. But it shares the same Board of Directors and the same staff.

Strictly speaking, the Institute has no direct link with either Government. But, in fact, senior officials of both Governments have been active in the Arctic Institute.

The Institute is considered the authoritative body on research and planning on the Arctic.

The problems of the Arctic and the Great Lakes are scarcely comparable. But I think there is a possibility that an agency modeled after the Arctic Institute might be a way to grapple with the problems of the Great Lakes.

In any case, present planning facilities for the Great Lakes are inadequate. Something needs to be done—and what we should be doing now is considering various alternatives.

I was heartened by the statements of President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson following their recent meeting at Camp David, Md.

They discussed the problems of the Great Lakes—including pollution and water levels—and they considered possibilities of working out an agreement between the two nations to help solve these problems.

It is not my purpose tonight to propose any final solutions.

But I want to stress that the Great Lakes, and the Canadians and Americans who depend on them, face some grave problems. And I also want to stress that as things now stand we do not have the means to cope with these problems. I am hopeful that talks between the executive branches of both countries will lead to agreements and, possibly, to a new United States-Canadian treaty.

My purpose tonight is to focus public attention on the problem in order to stimulate public discussion in the United States and Canada. For it will be public opinion finally that will persuade both Governments to reach an agreement for joint, long-range research, planning and development of the future uses of the Great Lakes.

We dare not wait. The threat that the world's largest supply of fresh water will become one vast dead sea is too ominous.

The time for action is now.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to reaffirm and reemphasize my support of the Constitution of the United States and particularly in reference to the 15th amendment which assures the right to vote to all citizens regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While this may seem a superfluous and unnecessary statement to make, I do so in view of the recent fervor and wave of emotionalism concerning efforts to implement the provisions of the 15th amendment.

I do not believe that there is great difference among the people of the United States as to the meaning of the 15th amendment, and the desirability as well as the necessity for enforcing it whenever the rights of any of our citizens to vote are denied or abridged. It seems, however, that any objection or criticism voiced against the pending proposal made by the President of the United States causes an immediate inference that the individual making the criticism is not sympathetic to the 15th amendment or willing to support enforcement of it.

I recognize that the 15th amendment provides for its enforcement by the Congress and I am willing to support legislation to achieve this. In fact, I will support legislation far more extensive in character than the proposal made by the President, if such action is required.

However, I think we should make every effort first to establish just what is required. The President's bill obviously was hurriedly written under the stress of great emotion. It is fraught with inconsistencies and inequities and therefore must be thoroughly studied and debated.

We must make certain that in our effort to prevent violation of the 15th amendment we do not "burn down the barn in order to get rid of the rats." I am afraid that this is what the proposal made by the President does as it now stands and certainly we can all agree that two wrongs do not make a single right.

Among my objections to the proposal offered by the President is that while it attempts to protect the rights of citizens under the 15th amendment, it violates article I, section 2, as well as the 17th amendment of the Constitution, which specifically provides for the States to set the qualifications of voters.

The present bill, in my opinion, denies due process and equal protection of the law, as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, to a large segment of our people in the States to which it applied. Further, it would seem that the bill as written inflicts punishment without judicial hearing and is therefore a "bill of attainder" in violation of section 9 of article I of the Constitution.

It seems that there should be some way of preventing unfair application of voter qualifications without eliminating the qualifications entirely. While we all agree that there should be equal right to vote I think we likewise can agree that there should be a reasonable requirement of intelligence. However, if the separate States do not care to make this minimum requirement they are not required to do so by the Constitution but neither are they prevented from so doing.

Another serious deficiency in the President's proposal is that it uses an arbitrary, and, in fact, punitive formula by which we would enforce the 15th amendment. The formula assumes that discrimination exists in some six States in this Nation, but not in the other States. Its double application would make it necessary for Federal registrars to come into my own State, Virginia, and register an illiterate voter because less than 50 percent voted and we have a literacy test. But in New York State, where a literacy test is also required, the same illiterate voter would not be allowed to register because New York's literacy test is not questioned since more than 50 percent of the adult population voted in the last election there.

It has been observed that because of the literacy test embodied in the constitution of the State of New York, thousands of Puerto Ricans, who are literate in Spanish but not in English, are disfranchised. Under the administration's proposal this practice is perfectly legal. The question could well be asked about other States, particularly the State of Texas, where less than 50 percent of the adult population went to the polls in 1964. But Texas is not included in the legislation because a literacy test is not used. Could public apathy and lack of a strong two-party system in Texas have been responsible for less than 50 percent participation—or could there have been discrimination which should bring the State of Texas under this bill, which certainly should be seeking to enforce the 15th amendment equally for all citizens regardless of where they live?

Mr. Speaker, I will support a proper proposal that will implement and enforce the provisions of the 15th amendment

equally and uniformly throughout every State of this Nation without prohibiting reasonable provisions requiring mini-

mum intelligence and standards of citizenship. The present proposals do not meet these standards.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the flag of the United States of America flies at half-mast this morning, paying tribute of honorable memory to the life and service of a Member of this Chamber. We are grateful for the long leadership, clarity of purpose, and sincerity in decision of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina who now rests from his labors with the peace which only God can give. The influence of Olin D. Johnston reaches our hearts and minds today. Be with his wife and family through the Easter message of eternal life.

We thank Thee for morning light and evening peace; for the few days of rest at home of these Senators, that has restored the spirit's strength. Now lead them this day into larger service.

Clouds of questions and discouragement hang over the world today. Threatenings of nation against nation make loud voices in the air. Give, O God, to the men of right the courage to stand firm where firmness is justified, meekness and strong understanding when peace can be won by this spirit, and sound judgment after crystallizing all points of view and convictions through prayer and reasoning.

"God of the strong, God of the weak,
Lord of all lands and our own land,
Light of all souls, from Thee we seek
Light from Thy light, strength from
Thy hand."

We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 13, Thursday, April 15, and Monday, April 19, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate, on April 14, 1965, received a message in writing from the President of the United States, transmitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, on April 20, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate received a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the nomination of William

C. Foster, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, April 13, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate on April 14, 1965, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 14, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Olin D. Johnston, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The message announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2594) to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during

the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is with profound sorrow that I announce the death of my colleague, the late Senator Olin D. Johnston.

Senator Johnston leaves behind a long and successful career of political service.

He was born on a farm near Honea Path, S.C., on November 18, 1896, to E. A. and Leila Webb Johnston. His studies at Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C., were interrupted by World War I in which he served as a volunteer with the 117th Engineers of the 42d Division. He served for 18 months overseas.

After the war, he resumed his studies at Wofford College and earned a B.A. degree in 1921. Subsequently, he earned a master's degree at the University of South Carolina in 1923 and the bachelor of law degree in 1924 from the University of South Carolina.

He was elected to his first political office in 1922 as a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives from Anderson County. In 1926 he was elected to the house of representatives from Spartanburg County, having moved his home to Spartanburg in 1924. He served in the house of representatives until 1930.

He narrowly missed being elected Governor in 1930, and 4 years later, in 1934, he was elected as Governor of South Carolina. He was elected again as Governor of South Carolina in 1942, and in 1944, he was elected to the U.S. Senate where he served continuously until the time of his death.

Senator Johnston had a large and loyal political following in the State of South Carolina. He was one of the most popular leaders to serve the people of South Carolina in the history of our State as is shown by the numerous times the people entrusted him with positions of great responsibility—twice with the governorship and four times with a seat in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Johnston leaves behind him a long record of dedicated and distinguished service in South Carolina and the U.S. Senate, and many staunch friends and admirers in South Carolina, Washington, and throughout the country. He will long be remembered for his warm human kindness and his strong determination to serve his fellow man. Mr. President, it is my intention to reserve my fuller remarks on the death of Sena-